UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,669	05/11/2005	Tatsuya Ikeda	NGB-38149	6536
52054 PEARNE & GO	7590 08/19/200 ORDON LLP	EXAMINER		
1801 EAST 9TI SUITE 1200	<del>-</del>		MARC, MCDIEUNEL	
	ОН 44114-3108		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3664	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com dchervenak@pearne.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,669	IKEDA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MCDIEUNEL MARC	3664
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind  d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 (2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> .      Since this application is in condition for allowatelessed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/  Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examin 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2005 is/are: a	awn from consideration.  for election requirement.	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correctable.  The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/534,669 Page 2

Art Unit: 3664

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-6 are presented for examination.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. The term "operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is determined by the primary teaching device" in claim 2 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The above term is not defined by the claim as to how the determination/permission/access is to be given by the primary device, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/534,669 Page 3

Art Unit: 3664

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,245,990 B2).

As per claim 1, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot (see title) comprising: a manipulator having a tool at a tip end (see fig. 1, element 1, wherein the robot mechanism being considered having a tool), a robot control unit for controlling the manipulator (see fig. 1, element 2); and a primary teaching device and a subsidiary teaching device each for controlling the manipulator through the robot control unit (see fig. 1, elements 4 and 6), note even though elements 4 and 6 are not separate, but they are considered as primary and subsidiary, wherein operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is restricted as compared with operation capable of being conducted by the primary teaching device (see fig. 1, wherein element 4 being considered restricted vis-a-vis the teaching pendant).

As per claim 2, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is determined by the primary teaching device (being considered as design choice due to the broad nature of the limitation).

As per claim 3, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is classified as a user level by the primary teaching device (see fig. 1, element 4, wherein the user/operator initiate the command), and the

subsidiary teaching device includes a user level judging function (see fig. 1, elements 3-4, and abstract particularly "A robot control unit for controlling a robot mechanism unit constantly detects the status of a robot and stores it as robot status data" being taken as judging).

As per claim 4, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein the primary teaching device and subsidiary teaching device are detachably attached to the robot control unit (element 4 being taken as detachable, due to its well known in the art), and either the primary teaching device or the subsidiary teaching device is connected to the robot control unit (see fig. 1, elements 2-4).

As per claim 5, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein the robot control unit includes a storage device for storing information to restrict operation when the primary teaching device or the subsidiary teaching device is connected to the robot control unit (see fig. 1, elements 2, 4, 6 and abstract, wherein according to the status being taken as judging).

As per claim 6, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein the primary teaching device and subsidiary teaching device are simultaneously connected to the robot control unit, and the primary teaching device includes a user judging function (see fig. 1, elements 4, 6 and abstract, wherein according to the status being taken as judging as noted above).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MCDIEUNEL MARC whose telephone number is (571)272-6964. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 Mon-Thu.

Application/Control Number: 10/534,669 Page 5

Art Unit: 3664

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on (571) 272-6919. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/McDieunel Marc/

Examiner, Art Unit 3664

Wednesday, August 06, 2008

/KHOI TRAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664